Optimization-based State Estimation under Bounded Disturbances

Wuhua Hu, Lihua Xie, and Keyou You

arXiv:1410.5033v2 [math.DS] 17 Mar 2015

***Abstract*—This paper studies an optimization-based state estimation approach for discrete-time nonlinear systems under bounded process and measurement disturbances. We first introduce a full information estimator (FIE), which is given as a solution to minimize a cost function by using all the available measurements. Then, we prove that the FIE of an incrementally input/output-to-state stable system is robustly globally asymptotically stable under a certain class of cost functions. Moreover, the implications and relationships with related results in the literature are discussed. Finally, a simple example is included to illustrate the theoretical results.**

***Index Terms*—Nonlinear systems; full information estimation; bounded disturbances; stability**

I. Introduction

Optimization-based estimation and in particular, a moving-horizon estimator (MHE) has attracted extensive attention recently [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. MHE only uses the latest information to do optimization-based estimation, and has advantages in nonlinear systems over classical approaches such as extended Kalman filter (EKF) [8, 9]. In contrast, a full information version (FIE) of the optimization-based estimator uses all the historical information for the state estimation. Although FIE is generically intractable, it is fundamentally important as it provides a performance benchmark for other estimators [4].

Fundamental results on FIE were recently reviewed in [4]. When the system is incrementally input/output-to-state stable (i-IOSS), an FIE is robustly globally asymptotically stable (RGAS) for *convergent* process and measurement disturbances if the cost function of the FIE satisfies certain conditions. However, it is unclear under what conditions the above conclusion still holds for *bounded* process and measurement disturbances, which obviously happens more often in practice. The authors posted this challenge as an open problem in the review paper.

This paper provides sufficient conditions for an FIE to be RGAS under bounded disturbances. The conditions require an appropriately defined cost function for the FIE, while the system is assumed to be i-IOSS. The general conditions become specific ones for three special cases, including the one investigated in [10] (a work inspired by Theorem 1 of this paper). We also note that the FIE having the RGAS property may be viewed as a kind of state observer for nonlinear systems which has attracted continuous attention and been researched for a long time [11, 12].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce notation and define the FIE under bounded disturbances. In Section III, we present sufficient conditions for the FIE to be RGAS, followed by a numerical example in Section IV. Finally, we draw conclusions in Section V.

This research was supported in part by the National High Technology Research and Development Program (863 Program) of China (2013AA040703). The first author thanks Professor James B. Rawlings for useful discussion on an initial version of this work, and Ji Luo for his useful comments.

W. Hu and L. Xie are with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. {hwh, elhxie}@ntu.edu.sg

K. You is with the Department of Automation and TNList, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P. R. China. youky@tsinghua.edu.cn

II. Full Information Estimation

We adopt the notation used in [4] for the problem formulation. The symbols $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ denote the sets of real numbers, nonnegative real numbers and nonnegative integers, respectively; and $\mathbb{I}_{a:b}$ denotes the set of integers from a to b. The symbol $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. The bold symbol $\boldsymbol{x}$, denotes a sequence of vector-valued variables x, $\{x(0),\, x(1),\, ...\}$. The notation $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|$ is the supreme norm over a sequence, $\sup_{i\geq 0}|x(i)|$, and $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{a:b}$ denotes $\max_{a\leq i\leq b}|x(i)|$. The frequently used $\mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{K}_\infty$, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions are defined as follows.

Definition 1. *($\mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{K}_\infty$, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions) A function $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a $\mathcal{K}$-function if it is continuous, zero at zero, and strictly increasing, and a $\mathcal{K}_\infty$-function if α is a $\mathcal{K}$-function and satisfies $\alpha(s) \to \infty$ as $s \to \infty$. A function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a $\mathcal{L}$-function if it is continuous, nonincreasing and satisfies $\varphi(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. A function $\beta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a $\mathcal{KL}$-function if, for each $t \geq 0$, $\beta(\cdot, t)$ is a $\mathcal{K}$-function and for each $s \geq 0$, $\beta(s, \cdot)$ is a $\mathcal{L}$-function.*

The following properties of the $\mathcal{K}$- and $\mathcal{KL}$-functions will be used in proving our main results.

Lemma 1. *[4] Given a $\mathcal{K}$-function α and a $\mathcal{KL}$-function β, the following holds for all $a_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $i \in \mathbb{I}_{1:n}$, and all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,*

$$\alpha\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha(n a_i),\ \beta\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i, t\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta(n a_i, t).$$

In this work, we consider a discrete-time nonlinear system described by

$$x^+ = f(x, w),\ y = h(x) + v, \tag{1}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the system state, $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the measurement, $w \in \mathbb{R}^g$ the process disturbance, $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the measurement disturbance, and $x^+ \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the system state at the next sample time. A control input known up to the present time can be included but can be ignored in the formulation for the state estimation [4]. The functions f and h are assumed to be continuous and known, and the initial state $x(0)$ and the disturbances (w, v) are modeled as unknown but *bounded*

variables, which covers convergent disturbances as a special case.

The state estimation problem is to find an optimal estimator of state $\boldsymbol{x}$ based on measurement $\boldsymbol{y}$ as recorded for all sampled times. This can be formulated as an optimization problem, yielding the so-called FIE. Let the decision variables be $(\boldsymbol{\chi}, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, which correspond to the system variables $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{v})$, and the optimal decision variables be $(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{v}})$. Since $(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{v}})$, which consist of optimal estimates at all sampled times, are uniquely determined once $\hat{x}(0)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}$ are known, the decision variables essentially reduce to $\chi(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Let t be the current time and $\bar{x}_0$ be the prior information for the initial state. The uncertainty in the initial state is thus denoted by $\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0$. Denote the cost function as $V_t(\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega})$, which penalizes uncertainties in both the initial state and the process. Then the FIE is defined as an optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FIE}: \quad & \inf_{\chi_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}} V_t(\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ \text{subject to, } & \chi^+ = f(\chi, \omega),\ y = h(\chi) + \nu, \\ & \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{B}_w, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{B}_v, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ denote the sequences of variables $\{\omega(i)\}$ and $\{\nu(i)\}$ for $i \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t}$, respectively, and $\mathbb{B}_w$ and $\mathbb{B}_v$ denote two sets of bounded sequences of disturbances. If the actual disturbances are further known to converge to zero, then the two sets denote sequences of the convergent disturbances.

One important problem with the FIE is to identify conditions under which the above optimization has an optimal solution for $(\chi(0), \boldsymbol{\omega})$ such that the state estimate satisfies the RGAS property defined below. Let $\boldsymbol{x}(x_0, \boldsymbol{w})$ denote a state sequence with an initial condition $x(0) = x_0$, and a disturbance sequence $\boldsymbol{w} = \{w(0), w(1), ...\}$.

Definition 2. *(RGAS [4]) The estimate is based on the noisy measurement $\boldsymbol{y} = h(\boldsymbol{x}(x_0, \boldsymbol{w})) + \boldsymbol{v}$. The estimate is RGAS if for all x_0 and $\bar{x}_0$, and bounded $(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{v})$, there exist functions $\beta_x \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\alpha_w, \alpha_v \in \mathcal{K}$ such that the following inequality holds for all $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & |x(t; x_0, \boldsymbol{w}) - x(t; \hat{x}(0|t), \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t)| \\ & \leq \beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}), \end{aligned}$$

in which $\hat{x}(0|t)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t$ are respectively the initial state estimate and the estimated disturbances using measurements up to time t, and $x(t; x_0, \boldsymbol{w})$ denotes the system state of (1) at time t with the initial state x_0 and disturbance $\boldsymbol{w}$.

Note that we also consider the current measurement $y(t)$, which is ignored in the original definition [4]. To obtain an RGAS FIE, the cost function needs to appropriately penalize the uncertainties in the initial state and the system, and the system dynamics should satisfy certain conditions. We identify and present such sufficient conditions in the next section.

III. RGAS OF THE FIE

We first introduce two definitions and one useful lemma as used in the sequel.

Definition 3. *(i-IOSS [4, 11]) The system $x^+ = f(x, w)$, $y = h(x)$ is i-IOSS if there exist functions $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that for every two initial states x_{01}, x_{02}, and two disturbances $\boldsymbol{w}_1, \boldsymbol{w}_2$, the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & |x(t; x_{01}, \boldsymbol{w}_1) - x(t; x_{02}, \boldsymbol{w}_2)| \leq \beta(|x_{01} - x_{02}|, t) \\ & + \alpha_1(\|\boldsymbol{w}_1 - \boldsymbol{w}_2\|_{0:t-1}) + \alpha_2(\|\boldsymbol{y}_1 - \boldsymbol{y}_2\|_{0:t}), \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The definition of i-IOSS can be interpreted as a "detectability" concept for nonlinear systems [11], as the state may be "detected" from the *noise-free* output by (3).

In particular, if in (3) $\beta(s, t) = \alpha(s)a^t$ for all $s, t \geq 0$, with $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ and a being a constant within $(0, 1)$, the system is said to be *exponentially i-IOSS* or *exp-i-IOSS* for short. This can be viewed as extending the exponential input-to-state stability [13, 14] to the context of i-IOSS.

Definition 4. *($\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function) A $\mathcal{KL}$-function β is called a $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function if there exist functions $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\beta(s, t) = \alpha(s)\varphi(t)$, for all $s, t \geq 0$.*

As an example, the $\mathcal{KL}$-function se^{-t} is a $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function for $s, t \geq 0$. The next lemma shows the general interest of a $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function.

Lemma 2. *($\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ bound) Given an arbitrary $\mathcal{KL}$-function β, there exists a $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function $\bar{\beta}$ such that $\beta(s, t) \leq \bar{\beta}(s, t)$ for all $s, t \geq 0$.*

Proof: By Lemma 8 in [15], given arbitrary $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$, there exist two functions $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that $\beta(s, t) \leq \alpha_1(s)\alpha_2(e^{-t}) =: \bar{\beta}(s, t)$ for all $s, t \geq 0$. Since $\bar{\beta}(s, t)$ is a $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function in s and t, this completes the proof. ■

Lemma 2 implies that the i-IOSS property in (3) can be defined equivalently using a $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function, which is useful in our later stability analysis of the FIE. Next, we introduce two assumptions for establishing our main result.

Assumption 1. *The FIE's cost function, $V_t(\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega})$, is defined to be continuous and satisfy the following inequalities for all $\chi(0), \bar{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{B}_w$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{B}_v$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \varrho_x(|\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \varUpsilon_w(\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{0:t-1}) + \varUpsilon_v(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_{0:t}) \\ & \leq V_t(\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ & \leq \rho_x(|\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_{0:t}), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\varrho_x, \rho_x \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\varUpsilon_w, \varUpsilon_v, \gamma_w, \gamma_v \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

Assumption 2. *The $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions in (3)-(4) satisfy the following inequalities for all $s_x, s_w, s_v, t \geq 0$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta\left(s_x + \varUpsilon_{x,t}^{-1}\left(\rho_x(s_x, t) + \gamma_w(s_w) + \gamma_v(s_v)\right), t\right) \\ & \leq \bar{\beta}_x(s_x, t) + \bar{\alpha}_w(s_w) + \bar{\alpha}_v(s_v), \end{aligned}$$

in which $\varUpsilon_{x,t}(s) := \varrho_x(s, t)$ and $\varUpsilon_{x,t}^{-1}(\cdot)$ defines its inverse function, and $\bar{\beta}_x$, $\bar{\alpha}_w$ and $\bar{\alpha}_v$ are proper $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions, respectively.

Assumption 1 ensures the FIE to have a property resembling the i-IOSS property of the system, and Assumption 2 ensures the FIE to be more sensitive to the initial state than the system to be. These will be clearer in the following corollaries. Under the above two assumptions, we establish our main result.

Theorem 1. *(RGAS of the FIE) Suppose that the infimum*

in (2) is attainable, and the system (1) is i-IOSS. Under Assumptions 1-2, the FIE in (2) is RGAS. Moreover, if we know that the disturbances $w(t)$ and $v(t)$ converge to zero in time, then the FIE converges to the true state as $t \to \infty$.

Proof: (a) *RGAS.* Let the global optimal solution of the FIE result in a minimum cost V_t^o. It follows that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$V_t^o = V_t(\hat{x}(0|t) - \bar{x}_0,\, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t) \leq V_t(x_0 - \bar{x}_0,\, \boldsymbol{w}) =: \bar{V}_t.$$

By Assumption 1 we have

$$\bar{V}_t \leq \rho_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}).$$

Together with $\varUpsilon_{x,\,t}(|\hat{x}(0|t) - \bar{x}_0|) := \varrho_x(|\hat{x}(0|t) - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \leq V_t^o \leq \bar{V}_t$, this leads to $|\hat{x}(0|t) - \bar{x}_0| \leq \varUpsilon_{x,\,t}^{-1}(\bar{V}_t)$, where $\varUpsilon_{x,\,t}^{-1}(\bar{V}_t)$ is dependent on time t. By using the triangle inequality, this further results in

$$\begin{aligned} &|x_0 - \hat{x}(0|t)| \leq |x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + |\hat{x}(0|t) - \bar{x}_0| \\ &\leq |x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \varUpsilon_{x,\,t}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} \rho_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \\ +\gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The second term on right hand side of the second inequality is dependent on time t.

Next we derive a bound for the term $\|\boldsymbol{w} - \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{0:t-1}$. From the triangle inequality we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{w} - \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{0:t-1} \leq \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1} + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{0:t-1}\,. \tag{6}$$

Since $\varUpsilon_w(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{0:t-1}) \leq V_t^o \leq \bar{V}_t$, it implies that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{0:t-1} \leq \varUpsilon_w^{-1}(\bar{V}_t)$. Consequently, it follows from (6) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\boldsymbol{w} - \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{0:t-1} \\ &\leq \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1} + \varUpsilon_w^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} \rho_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \\ +\gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\leq \rho_x^w(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1} \\ &\quad + \gamma_w^w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v^w(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\rho_x^w := \varUpsilon_w^{-1} \circ \rho_x$, $\gamma_w^w := \varUpsilon_w^{-1} \circ \gamma_w$ and $\gamma_v^w := \varUpsilon_w^{-1} \circ \gamma_v$ which are $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions, respectively. By applying the same reasoning to $\|\boldsymbol{v} - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t\|_{0:t-1}$, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{v} - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t\|_{0:t} &\leq \rho_x^v(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \\ &\quad + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t} + \gamma_w^v(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v^v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where ρ_x^v, γ_w^v and γ_v^v are $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions, respectively.

Substitute (5)-(8) into (3) of i-IOSS leads to (9), where Assumption 2 has been used to derive the last inequality. As the sums of terms in the three lines of the last inequality form classes $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions, respectively, we can denote them as $\beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t)$, $\alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1})$ and $\alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t})$ in sequence, and hence conclude from (9) that

$$\begin{aligned} &|x(t;\, x_0,\, \boldsymbol{w}) - x(t;\, \hat{x}(0|t),\, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t)| \\ &\leq \beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}). \end{aligned}$$

This means that the FIE is RGAS, and hence completes the RGAS proof.

(b) *Convergence*. Let the sequences of $\boldsymbol{w}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be bounded as $\|\boldsymbol{w}\| \leq M_w$ and $\|\boldsymbol{v}\| \leq M_v$ for some constants $M_w, M_v \geq 0$. Since the FIE is RGAS, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|x(t; x_0, \boldsymbol{w}) - x(t; \hat{x}(0|t), \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t)| \\ &\leq \beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \alpha_w(M_w) + \alpha_v(M_v), \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Because the disturbance and noise sequences are known to converge to zero, this knowledge constrains the feasible sets of the disturbance and noise estimates and ensures that these estimates obtained by the FIE defined in (2) will converge to zero. Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a time $T_\epsilon > 0$ such that $|w(t)|, |\hat{w}(t)| \leq 0.5\alpha_1^{-1}(\epsilon/8)$ and $|v(t)|, |\hat{v}(t)| \leq 0.5\alpha_2^{-1}(\epsilon/8)$ for all $t \geq T_\epsilon$. By the definition of $\mathcal{KL}$-function, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a time τ_ϵ such that $\beta\left(\beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,0) + \alpha_w(M_w) + \alpha_v(M_v), t\right) \leq \epsilon/2$ for all $t \geq \tau_\epsilon$. Hence, for $t \geq T_\epsilon + \tau_\epsilon$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|x(t; x_0, \boldsymbol{w}) - x(t; \hat{x}(0|t), \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t)| \\ &\overset{\text{by i-IOSS}}{\leq} \beta\left(|x(T_\epsilon; x_0, \boldsymbol{w}) - x(T_\epsilon; \hat{x}(0|t), \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t)|\,, t - T_\epsilon\right) \\ &\quad + \alpha_1(\|\boldsymbol{w} - \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{T_\epsilon:t-1}) + \alpha_2(\|\boldsymbol{v} - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t\|_{T_\epsilon:t}) \\ &\overset{\text{by RGAS}}{\leq} \beta\left(\beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,0) + \alpha_w(M_w) + \alpha_v(M_v), t - T_\epsilon\right) \\ &\quad + \alpha_1(2\,\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{T_\epsilon:t-1}) + \alpha_1(2\,\|\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t\|_{T_\epsilon:t-1}) \\ &\quad + \alpha_2(2\,\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{T_\epsilon:t}) + \alpha_2(2\,\|\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t\|_{T_\epsilon:t}) \\ &\leq \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/8 + \epsilon/8 + \epsilon/8 + \epsilon/8 = \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $x(t; \hat{x}(0|t), \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t)$ converges to $x(t; x_0, \boldsymbol{w})$ as $t \to \infty$. This completes the convergence proof. ■

Remark 1. *The RGAS proof is motivated from Proposition 11 of [4], which however can only be applied to the FIE with a specific cost function for convergent disturbances.*

Theorem 1 gives sufficient conditions for an FIE to be RGAS (or convergent) under bounded (or convergent) disturbances. From this point of view, it extends the results in [4].

Assumption 2 is rather general. Using the $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-function introduced in Definition 4, we can obtain more specific conditions admitting easier interpretation.

Corollary 1. *The FIE defined in (2) is RGAS if the following conditions are satisfied:*

a) the system given in (1) is i-IOSS;

b) the FIE's cost function satisfies Assumption 1, and the infimum is attainable;

c) the $\mathcal{KL}$-functions β in (3) and ϱ_x, ρ_x in (4) are $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$-functions in the form of $\beta(s,\, t) = \mu_1(s)\varphi_1(t)$, $\varrho_x(s,\, t) = \mu_2(s)\varphi_2(t)$ and $\rho_x(s,\, t) = \mu_3(s)\varphi_2(t)$, where μ_1, μ_2, $\mu_3 \in \mathcal{K}$, and $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{L}$, and satisfy

$$\mu_1\left(4\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi(s)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right)\right)\varphi_1(t) \leq \pi'(s) \tag{10}$$

for an arbitrary $\pi \in \mathcal{K}$ and some $\pi' \in \mathcal{K}$.

Proof: It is sufficient to show that Assumption 2 is satisfied under the condition c). With $\varUpsilon_{x,\,t}(s) := \varrho_x(s,\, t) = \mu_2(s)\varphi_2(t)$ and $\rho_x(s,\, t) = \mu_3(s)\varphi_2(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta\left(4\varUpsilon_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s_x,\, t)\right),\, t\right) = \beta\left(4\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{3\rho_x(s_x,\, t)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right),\, t\right) \\ &= \beta\left(4\mu_2^{-1}\left(3\mu_3(s_x)\right),\, t\right) =: \bar{\beta}_x(s_x,\, t), \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|x(t;\, x_0,\, \boldsymbol{w}) - x(t;\, \hat{x}(0|t),\, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_t)| \\
&\le \beta\left(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t\right) + \gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(\rho_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t})\right),\, t\big) \\
&\quad + \alpha_1\left(\rho_x^w(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1} + \gamma_w^w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v^w(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t})\right) \\
&\quad + \alpha_2\left(\rho_x^v(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t} + \gamma_w^v(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v^v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t})\right) \\
&\le \bar{\beta}_x\left(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t\right) + \alpha_1\left(4\rho_x^w(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t)\right) + \alpha_2\left(4\rho_x^v(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t)\right) \\
&\quad + \bar{\alpha}_w\left(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}\right) + \alpha_1\left(4\,\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}\right) + \alpha_1\left(4\gamma_w^w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1})\right) + \alpha_2\left(4\gamma_w^v(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1})\right) \\
&\quad + \bar{\alpha}_v\left(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}\right) + \alpha_1\left(4\gamma_v^w(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t})\right) + \alpha_2\left(4\,\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}\right) + \alpha_2\left(4\gamma_v^v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t})\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{9}
$$

which results in a $\mathcal{KL}$-function. With $\beta(s,t) = \mu_1(s)\varphi_1(t)$ and the condition (10), we also have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta\left(4\gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_w(s_w)\right),\, t\right) &= \mu_1\left(4\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{3\gamma_w(s_w)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right)\right)\varphi_1(t) \\
&\le \bar{\alpha}_w(s_w),
\end{aligned}
$$

for some function $\bar{\alpha}_w \in \mathcal{K}$. Similarly we have $\beta\left(4\gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_v(s_v)\right),\, t\right) \le \bar{\alpha}_v(s_v)$, for some function $\bar{\alpha}_v \in \mathcal{K}$. Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\beta\left(s_x + \gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(\rho_x(s_x,\, t) + \gamma_w(s_w) + \gamma_v(s_v)\right),\, t\right) \\
&\le \beta\left(\begin{array}{c} s_x + \gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s_x,\, t)\right) \\ +\gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_w(s_w)\right) + \gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_v(s_v)\right) \end{array},\, t\right) \\
&\le \beta\left(4s_x,\, t\right) + \beta\left(4\gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s_x,\, t)\right),\, t\right) \\
&\quad + \beta\left(4\gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_w(s_w)\right),\, t\right) + \beta\left(4\gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_v(s_v)\right),\, t\right) \\
&\le \beta\left(4s_x,\, t\right) + \bar{\beta}_x(s_x,\, t) + \bar{\alpha}_w(s_w) + \bar{\alpha}_v(s_v) \\
&= \bar{\beta}'_x(s_x,\, t) + \bar{\alpha}_w(s_w) + \bar{\alpha}_v(s_v),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\bar{\beta}'_x(s_x,\, t) := \beta\left(4s_x,\, t\right) + \bar{\beta}_x(s_x,\, t)$ which is a $\mathcal{KL}$-function. The last inequity means that Assumption 2 is satisfied. Together with the conditions in a) and b), it establishes the conclusion by using Theorem 1. ∎

In the condition c) of Corollary 1, the assumption of β being a $\mathcal{K}\cdot\mathcal{L}$-function is trivial because we can always assign such a function as an alternative if the original $\mathcal{KL}$-function β is not in a $\mathcal{K}\cdot\mathcal{L}$ form (cf. Lemma 2). The condition that ϱ_x and ρ_x in (4) are $\mathcal{K}\cdot\mathcal{L}$-functions is not on the system dynamics, but a requirement on the cost function defined for the FIE. The key condition thus boils down to (10), requiring the cost function to be sufficiently sensitive (compared to the system's sensitivity) to the uncertainty in the initial state. This is intuitive because otherwise the estimator cannot detect the effect caused by the uncertainty and hence is unable to reconstruct the initial state accurately.

The FIE admits a more specific cost function if the system is i-IOSS as in (3) where the $\mathcal{KL}$ bound has a polynomial form.

Corollary 2. *The FIE defined in (2) is RGAS, if the following conditions are satisfied:*

a) the system (1) is i-IOSS with the $\mathcal{KL}$ bound being given as $\beta(s,t) = c_1 s^{a_1}(t+1)^{-b_1}$ for some constants $c_1, a_1, b_1 > 0$ and all $s, t \ge 0$;

b) the infimum in (2) is attainable when the cost function is defined as

$$
V_t(\mathcal{X}(0) - \bar{x}_0,\, \boldsymbol{\omega}) = l_x(\mathcal{X}(0) - \bar{x}_0)(t+1)^{-b_2} + l_{wv}(\boldsymbol{\omega},\, \boldsymbol{\nu},\, t),
$$

where b_2 is a positive constant, and the functions l_x and l_{wv} are continuous and satisfy the following inequalities for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{B}_w$ and $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{B}_v$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_2|x|^{a_2} =: \gamma'_x(|x|) &\le l_x(x) \le \gamma'_x(|x|), \\
\gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}) &\le l_{wv}(\boldsymbol{w},\, \boldsymbol{v},\, t) \\
&\le \gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{0:t-1}) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0:t}),
\end{aligned}
$$

in which c_2 and a_2 are positive constants, and $\gamma_w, \gamma_v, \gamma'_x, \gamma_w, \gamma_v \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$;

c) the above parameters a_2 and b_2 satisfy $\frac{a_2}{b_2} \ge \frac{a_1}{b_1}$.

Proof: It is straightforward to show that the cost function given above satisfies Assumption 1, in which the $\mathcal{KL}$-functions are given as $\varrho_x(|x|,\, t) := \gamma'_x(|x|)(t+1)^{-b_2}$ and $\rho_x := \gamma'_x(|x|)(t+1)^{-b_2}$. These two functions are factorizable as $\mu_2(s)\varphi_2(t)$ and $\mu_3(s)\varphi_2(t)$, respectively, with $\mu_2(s) := \gamma'_x(s) = c_2 s^{a_2}$, $\mu_3(s) := \gamma'_x(s)$ and $\varphi_2(t) := (t+1)^{-b_2}$. Given the condition a) above, the $\mathcal{KL}$ bound associated with the i-IOSS property of the system is obtained as $\beta_x(s,\, t) = \mu_1(s)\varphi_1(t)$, with $\mu_1(s) := c_1 s^{a_1}$ and $\varphi_1(t) := (t+1)^{-b_1}$. Then for any function $\pi \in \mathcal{K}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mu_1\left(4\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi(s)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right)\right)\varphi_1(t) \\
&= c_1\left(4\left(\frac{1}{c_2}\pi(s)(t+1)^{b_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{a_2}}\right)^{a_1}(t+1)^{-b_1} \\
&= 4^{a_1} c_1 c_2^{-\frac{a_1}{a_2}}(\pi(s))^{\frac{a_1}{a_2}}(t+1)^{\frac{a_1 b_2}{a_2} - b_1} \\
&\le 4^{a_1} c_1 c_2^{-\frac{a_1}{a_2}}(\pi(s))^{\frac{a_1}{a_2}} =: \pi'(s),
\end{aligned}
$$

where π' is a $\mathcal{KL}$-function, and the condition c) has been used to derive the inequality. Hence the condition c) of Corollary 1 is satisfied. As the conditions a) and b) there are also satisfied, this proves that the FIE is RGAS by Corollary 1. ∎

The conditions b)-c) of Corollary 2 are manifestations of the general conditions given in Theorem 1, subject to the condition a) here. We remark that this corollary recovers the main result in [10] if the design parameter b_2 is fixed to 1 (with a minor difference that here the FIE is able to utilize the last measurement in the estimation, whose fitting error is penalized through $\nu(t)$).

More specific cost functions that satisfy the conditions b)-c)

of Corollary 2 may have the following forms:

$$l_x(\mathcal{X}(0)-\bar{x}_0)(t+1)^{-b_2} := \frac{c_2|\mathcal{X}(0)-\bar{x}_0|^{a_2}}{(t+1)^{b_2}},$$

for positive constants a_2, b_2 satisfying $\frac{a_2}{b_2} \geq \frac{a_1}{b_1}$ and any positive constant c_2, and

$$l_{wv}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\nu}, t) = \frac{1}{t+1}\left(\lambda_w \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} l_{w,i}(\omega(i)) + \lambda_v \sum_{i=0}^{t} l_{v,i}(\nu(i))\right) + (1-\lambda_w)\max_{i\in\mathbb{I}_{0:t-1}} l_{w,i}(\omega(i)) + (1-\lambda_v)\max_{i\in\mathbb{I}_{0:t}} l_{w,i}(\nu(i)),$$

for given constants λ_w, $\lambda_v \in [0, 1]$, in which the functions $l_{w,i}$ and $l_{v,i}$ are such that:

$$\underline{\gamma}'_w(|w|) \leq l_{w,i}(w) \leq \gamma'_w(|w|),\ \underline{\gamma}'_v(|v|) \leq l_{v,i}(v) \leq \gamma'_v(|v|),$$

where $\underline{\gamma}'_w$, $\underline{\gamma}'_v$, γ'_w, $\gamma'_v \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

Furthermore, if the system described in (1) is exp-i-IOSS, then the polynomial $\mathcal{KL}$ bound in Corollary 2 can be tightened to have an exponential form. Consequently we may define a cost that better penalizes the deviation from the prior initial state estimate, which intuitively would improve FIE's estimation performance.

Corollary 3. *The FIE defined in (2) is RGAS, if the following conditions are satisfied:*

a) the system (1) is exp-i-IOSS with the $\mathcal{KL}$-function being given as $\beta(s, t) = c_1 s^{a_1} b_1^t$ for some constants $c_1, a_1 > 0$ and $0 < b_1 < 1$ and all $s, t \geq 0$;

b) the condition b) of Corollary 2 is satisfied with the factor $(t+1)^{-b_2}$ being replaced with b_2^t;

c) the parameters a_2 and b_2 satisfy $\sqrt[a_2]{b_2} \geq \sqrt[a_1]{b_1}$.

Proof: The proof follows a routine similar to that of the proof for Corollary 2 and is omitted for brevity. ∎

It is worthwhile to mention that the condition c) of Corollary 3 does not require $b_2 < 1$. That is, an FIE with $b_2 \geq 1$ may also be RGAS despite that the sub-cost associated with the initial state diverges in time. We will illustrate this in the simulation section.

By Corollary 3, it is valid to specify the sub-cost associated with the initial state as $c_2|\mathcal{X}(0) - \bar{x}_0|^{a_2} b_2^t$, with the positive constants $\{a_2, b_2, c_2\}$ satisfying the condition c) of Corollary 3. The sub-cost associated with the disturbances may be defined to have the same form presented after Corollary 2.

Remark 2. *As in [16], nonlinear systems that are asymptotically stable but not exponentially stable fail to be structurally stable and constitute a boundary set, and hence of little practical interest. They prove that the set of exponentially stable systems are dense in the whole set of asymptotically stable systems. It thus does not lose generality or practical interest for Corollary 3 to focus on i-IOSS systems that are exponentially stable.*

Remark 3. *The conclusion that the state estimate given by the FIE converges to the true state if we know the disturbances converge to zero remains true under the conditions of Corollaries 1-3. This is because the convergence is implied by the i-IOSS property of the system and the RGAS property of the estimator under bounded and convergent disturbances (cf. the proof of Theorem 1).*



Figure 1: Estimation results: (a) mean and variation of the state estimation error; (b) empirical cumulative distribution function plot of the state estimation error.

IV. Numerical Example

We use a simple example to illustrate the theoretical results concluded by Corollaries 2-3. Consider an asymptotically stable system with linear dynamics and nonlinear measurement: $x^+ = 0.9x + w$, $y = x^3 + v$, where x is the state, y the measurement, w the state disturbance, and v the measurement noise. The disturbance $\{w(k)\}$ and noise $\{v(k)\}$ are two sequences of independent, zero mean, normally distributed random variables with variances σ_w^2 and σ_v^2 equal to 0.1^2 and 0.2^2, respectively, as further truncated to the intervals $[-3\sigma_w, 3\sigma_w]$ and $[-3\sigma_v, 3\sigma_v]$, respectively. The initial state $x(0)$ is a random variable independent of the disturbances $\{w(k)\}$ and $\{v(k)\}$, and follows a normal distribution with a mean of 5 and a variance of $\sigma_{x_0}^2$ equal to 4. The prior estimate of the initial state is given as $\bar{x}_0 = 2$.

We can show that the system is exp-i-IOSS with the $\mathcal{K}\cdot\mathcal{L}$ bound given by $\beta(s, t) = s0.9^t$ (the proof is omitted for page limit). By Corollary 3, for the FIE to be RGAS its cost function can be specified as

$$V_t = \frac{(\chi(0)-\bar{x}_0)^2 b_2^t}{\sigma_{x_0}^2} + \frac{1}{t+1}\left(\frac{\lambda_w}{\sigma_w^2}\sum_{i=0}^{t-1}\omega^2(i) + \frac{\lambda_v}{\sigma_v^2}\sum_{i=0}^{t}\nu^2(i)\right) + \frac{1-\lambda_w}{\sigma_w^2}\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{0:t-1}^2 + \frac{1-\lambda_v}{\sigma_v^2}\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_{0:t}^2,$$

for any given constants $b_2 \geq 0.9^2 = 0.81$ and λ_w, $\lambda_v \in [0, 1]$. By solving the FIE (with $b_2 = 0.81$) subject to $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{0:t-1} \leq 3\sigma_w$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_{0:t} \leq 3\sigma_v$, we obtain the state estimates for each $t \in \mathbb{I}_{0:20}$. The estimation errors, defined by $e(t|t) = x(t) - \hat{x}(t|t)$, are averaged over 500 random instances, as shown in Fig. 1 for evenly sampled times. To compare, the state estimation errors resulting from a generic EKF [9] are also shown in the figure.

We observe that the FIE yields bounded estimation errors (which holds true for longer simulation times) and outperforms

the EKF significantly during the early estimation stage. Yet the advantage decays as the EKF accumulates sufficient iterations, say, when $t \geq 6$ in this case. The early advantage owes to FIE using all measurements accumulated to compute an optimal estimate of the present state, while the EKF merely uses the current measurement to update its previous estimate. From Fig. 1, we also observe that the FIE with $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 1$ results in more accurate estimation than with $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0$. Moreover, we applied the FIEs with $b_2 = 2$ for the two cases, which imposes a heavier and divergent sub-cost for deviation of the estimate of the initial state from its prior estimate. The FIEs yield slightly worse estimation results: when $b_2 = 0.81$, the state estimation error has a standard deviation of 0.065 (or 0.081) and an average absolute value of 0.037 (or 0.046) over $t \in \mathbb{I}_{0:20}$ for $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 1$ (or 0); in contrast, when $b_2 = 2$ the standard deviation and the average absolute value are equal to 0.068 and 0.038 (or, 0.091 and 0.057 for $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0$), respectively.

Additionally, we may use a looser $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ bound as $\beta(s,t) = s(t+1)^{\ln 0.9}$, and consequently the cost function can alternatively be defined by Corollary 2 as:

$$V_t' = \frac{(\chi(0) - \bar{x}_0)^2}{\sigma_{x_0}^2 (t+1)^{b_2}} + \frac{1}{t+1}\left(\frac{\lambda_w}{\sigma_w^2}\sum_{i=0}^{t-1}\omega^2(i) + \frac{\lambda_v}{\sigma_v^2}\sum_{i=0}^{t}\nu^2(i)\right) + \frac{1-\lambda_w}{\sigma_w^2}\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{0:t-1}^2 + \frac{1-\lambda_v}{\sigma_v^2}\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_{0:t}^2,$$

where $0 < b_2 \leq -2\ln 0.9 \approx 0.21$ and λ_w, λ_v are the same as above. We implemented the FIE with this new cost function for $b_2 = 0.21$ and ran simulations on the same instances. The state estimation results almost coincide with those obtained using the previous cost function for $b_2 = 0.81$: the standard deviation and the average absolute value are obtained as 0.065 and 0.037 (or, 0.082 and 0.046 for $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0$), respectively.

V. Conclusions

This paper presented sufficient conditions for a full information estimator (FIE) to be robustly globally asymptotically stable (RGAS) under bounded process and measurement disturbances. The conditions require that the cost function being optimized has a property resembling the i-IOSS stability of the system, but with a higher sensitivity to the uncertainty of the initial state. The results are applicable to convergent disturbances, yielding a stronger conclusion that the estimation error of the FIE converges to zero.

As the FIE becomes computationally intractable once the estimation time is large, it is practically important to extend our results to the moving-horizon estimator (MHE). Intuitively, this would require stringer conditions than those of the FIE. The future research is thus to establish such conditions and prove their sufficiency and/or necessity.

References

[1] A. Wynn, M. Vukov, and M. Diehl, "Convergence guarantees for moving horizon estimation based on the real-time iteration scheme," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 2215– 2221, 2014.

[2] M. Ellis, J. Zhang, J. Liu, and P. D. Christofides, "Robust moving horizon estimation based output feedback economic model predictive control," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 68, pp. 101–109, 2014.

[3] A. Voelker, K. Kouramas, and E. N. Pistikopoulos, "Moving horizon estimation: Error dynamics and bounding error sets for robust control," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 943–948, 2013.

[4] J. Rawlings and L. Ji, "Optimization-based state estimation: Current status and some new results," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 22, pp. 1439–1444, 2012.

[5] A. Alessandri, M. Baglietto, and G. Battistelli, "Moving-horizon state estimation for nonlinear discrete-time systems: New stability results and approximation schemes," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 1753–1765, 2008.

[6] J. Rawlings and B. Bakshi, "Particle filtering and moving horizon estimation," *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 1529–1541, 2006.

[7] C. Rao, J. Rawlings, and D. Mayne, "Constrained state estimation for nonlinear discrete-time systems: Stability and moving horizon approximations," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 246–258, 2003.

[8] L. Ljung, "Asymptotic behavior of the extended kalman filter as a parameter estimator for linear systems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 36–50, 1979.

[9] E. Haseltine and J. Rawlings, "Critical evaluation of extended kalman filtering and moving-horizon estimation," *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 2451–2460, 2005.

[10] L. Ji, J. B. Rawlings, W. Hu, A. Wynn, I. Coll, and M. Diehl, "Robust stability of moving horizon estimation under bounded disturbances," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, To appear, 2015.

[11] E. Sontag and Y. Wang, "Output-to-state stability and detectability of nonlinear systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 279–290, 1997.

[12] E. D. Sontag, "Input to state stability: Basic concepts and results," in *Nonlinear and Optimal Control Theory*. Springer, 2008, pp. 163–220.

[13] L. Grüne, "Input-to-state stability of exponentially stabilized semilinear control systems with inhomogeneous perturbations," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 27–35, 1999.

[14] B. Liu, D. J. Hill, and Y. Sun, "Exponential input-to-state stability for hybrid dynamical networks via impulsive interconnection," in *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2010, pp. 673–678.

[15] E. D. Sontag, "Comments on integral variants of ISS," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 93–100, 1998.

[16] M. D. Glas, "Exponential stability revisited," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 1505–1510, 1987.